STATE OF MONTANA BEFORE THE BOARD OF PERSONNEL APPEALS

In the matter of Unfair Labor Practice No. 1-87:

MONTANA PUBLIC EMPLOYEES ASSOCIATION, MPEA; and MIKE MAHAN;

Complainant,

~V3-

FINAL ORDER

PINE HILLS SCHOOL, ALLAN DAVIS, SUPERINTENDENT, MILES CITY, MONTANA,

Defendant/Employer.)

The Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Roccommended Order were issued by Hearing Examiner Arlyn L. Plowman on August 20, 1987.

Exceptions to the Findings of Fact, Conclusions and Law and Recommended Order were filed by the Personnel Division, Department of Administration on September 9, 1987.

Oral argument was scheduled before the Board of Personnel Appeals on November 30, 1987.

After reviewing the record, considering the briefs and oral arguments, the Board orders as follows:

- IT IS ORDERED that the Exceptions to the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Recommended Order are hereby denied.
- 2. IT IS ORDERED that this Board therefore adopt the Findings of Pact, Conclusions of Law and Recommended Order of Hearing Examiner Arlyn Plowman as the Final Order of this Board.

18

19

20. 21

22

23

24

25 26

27

28

29

30 31

The hearings examiner's proposed decision is novertheless adopted with one qualification. The hearings examiner made certain findings that the employer had failed to institute a program of progressive discipline or warnings. The Board does not find these findings particularly persuasive or supportive of the conclusions of law in this matter, and does not intend to give these findings any precedential value.

DATED this _24^{TL} day of February, 1988.

BOARD OF PERSONNEL APPRAIS

By -/hn/ yreelyn

Chairman

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

correct copy of the above document was molled to the following on the 2422 day of February, 1988:

Kathleen Holden Associate Legal Counsel Personnel Division Department of Administration Room 130 - Mitchell Building Helena, MT 59620

David W. Stiteler Staff Attorney Montana Public Employees Association P.O. Box 5600 Helena, MT 59604

Allan Bavis, Superintendent Pine Hills School P.O. Box 1058 Miles City, MT 59301

31

1

2

3

4

ż

6

7

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

STATE OF MONTANA BEFORE THE BOARD OF PERSONNEL APPEALS

In the matter of Unfair Labor Practice No. 1-07:

MONTANA PUBLIC EMPLOYEES ASSOCIATION, MPEA; and MIKE MAHAN

Complainant,

Will ..

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW; AND RECOMMENDED ORDER
LLS SCHOOL, ALLAN

.

FINDINGS OF PACT:

PINE HILLS SCHOOL, ALLAN DAVIS, SUPERINTENDENT, MILES CITY, HONTANA,

Defendant/Employer.

I. INTRODUCTION

A hearing on the above-captioned matter was held on July 16, 1987, in the courtroom of the Custer County Courthouse, Miles City, Montana. At the hearing David Stiteler, attorney, represented the Montane Public Employees Association and Carole Colbo, Labor Relations Specialist, State Personnel Division, Department of Administration, State of Montana represented the Pine Hills School. Arlyn L. Plowman was the Hearing Examiner. The parties had the opportunity to present documentary evidence and testimony of witnesses in the support of their case. Upon the conclusion of rebuttal testimony, the parties waived closing arguments in favor of post-hearing briefs. The briefs were to be submitted postmarked no later than August 7, 1987. Timely briefs were filed and the matter was deemed submitted on August 10, 1987.

II. BACKGROUND

This hearing arose out of an unfair labor practice charge complaint filed on or about January 5, 1987, by the Montana Public Employees Association (MPEA) against the Pine Hills School. That charge alleged that the Pine Hills

3

5

1

2

7

8

10

11

...

12

13

14

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25 26

27

28

29 30

31

School violated the Montana Collective Bargaining Law for Public Employees (Section 39-31-101, et seq., MCA) by discharging Mike Mahan for his involvement in certain protected activities.

The employer/defendant, Pine Bills School, responded timely to the complaint and denied that Mike Mahan's protected activity was a factor in his discharge. The employer further asserted that the employee was discharged for unsatisfactory performance.

On January 38, 1987, the Board of Personnel Appeals appointed Michael T. Furlong to investigate the allegations contained within the complaint. On March 26, 1987 an investigator's report was issued finding that the allegations contained probable merit.

Subsequently, the Board of Personnel Appeals appointed Arlyn L. Plowman as Hearing Examiner and a Notice of Hearing was issued May 20, 1987. A pre-hearing conference was held on July 1, 1987 by telephone.

III. PINDINGS OF PACT

I

Ö

1. Mike Mahan was hired by the Pine Hills School as a Cottage Life Attendant on May 12, 1986. He was hired under the provisions of an On the Job Training (OJT) program. The OJT program subsidized his employment for a specified training period. He completed the OJT program and continued his employment with the Pine Hills School. He was a probationary employee. He would have completed his probationary period November 12, 1986.

Mike Mahan had previously been employed by the Fine Bills School in the school's dairy.

2. Mike Mahan's employment with the Pine Hills School as a Cottage Life Attendant was not without difficulty. Mike Mahan was involved in at least five instances wherein he received verbal reprinands,

۱

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

п

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

- a. Hay 23, 1986 Mike Mahan violated post orders and left a co-worker in a lodge by himself with twenty-five students. He was counseled by a program manager. He was not advised or warned that his job was in jeopardy.
- b. May 31, 1986 Mike Mahan was called a name by the residents. He reacted to this name calling using punitive measures. Once again he was counseled by a program manager and also by Larry Williams, Section Chief for Residential Services. Mike Mahan was reprimended for his punitive measures and his failure to implement progressive discipline. He was not advised or warned that his job was in jeopardy.
- c. August 20, 1986 Mike Mahan had a problem with a student. He became angry with the student and also angry with a co-worker in view of the students. Once again he was counseled by a program manager and Larry Williams. He was advised to learn to control his anger. Mike Mahan was not advised or warned that his job was in jeopardy.
- d. October 15, 1986 Mike Mahan contacted the program manger at Russell Lodge to discuss another employee's performance. Mike Mahan was angry with the co-worker and alleged that the co-worker would not back him up. A meeting was scheduled the next day to discuss the situation. However, at the time set for the meeting Mike Mahan was reticent to discuss what had prompted his complaint. Once again he was counseled by the program manager about controlling his anger and over-reacting to situations. Mike Mahan was not advised or warned his employment was in jeopardy.
- c. Movember 1, 1986 One of the residents was being transferred to Custer Lodge from the maximum security unit. There occurred an incident of name-calling between Mike Mahan and the student. The student had to be removed from the lodge by a security guard. Once again Mike Mahan was counseled by Larry Williams about his anger and how anger would not diffuse conflict with the students but would escalate the situation. Mike Mahan was not advised or warned that his employment was in jeopardy.

In all of the above instances any reprimends given were verbal; no written reprimends were issued. In none of the above instances did the employer institute a program of progressive discipline or remedial training.

3. During October of 1986, in concert with other Pine Hills School employees, Mike Mahan compiled a list of complaints concerning events and policies affecting their employment. These complaints were reduced to writing and the employees requested the help of local union officers in presenting the complaints to management.

ĸ.

tö

Ħ

The local union officers presented this list of complaints to Larry Williams. Larry Williams was less than pleased when presented with the complaints. In the response to his questions, the local union officers told Larry Williams that Mike Mahan was directly involved with the preparation and compilation of the complaints.

- 4. On November 5, 1986, Mike Mohan was given a termination letter signed by Larry Williams in which Mike Mahan was advised that his employment had been terminated due to performance deficiencies. The termination letter was written after recommendation for termination was received from at least one program manager, and after he consulted with and obtained the concurrence of Mr. Sealy, Director of Care and Custody and Mr. Davis, Superintendent of the Pine Hills School.
- 5. The timing and sequence of events must be considered. At most, only a few weeks passed between the time that the list of complaints was presented to the employer and the time of Mike Mahan's discharge.
- 6. On November 2, 1986 Larry Williams counseled Mike Mahan regarding an incident concerning name-calling between Mike Mahan and a student. This was the fourth time Mike Mahan had been counseled concerning angry reactions with students or other staff numbers. As in other instances, Mike Mahan was not warned that his job was in jeopardy.
 - 7. Several days later, on November 5, 1986, Larry

Williams discharged Mike Mahan, allegedly because the manner in which Mike Mahan related to and interacted with students was not conducive to their rehabilitation or treatment.

H

- 8. Mike Mahan had proviously worked for this employer. He completed an On the Job Training (OJT) program. At
 the time of his termination, he was within ten days of
 completing his six month probationary period. He was no
 stranger to the management of Pine Hills School. Long
 before the time of termination management must have known of
 his deficiencies and strengths, work habits and practices.
 There is nothing in the record showing that the employer
 considered extending his probationary period to correct
 deficiencies.
- 9. He may have been less than an exemplary employee. He had been counseled repeatedly; but he was never warned that his job was in jeopardy nor was there any mention of progressive discipline. (There is a certain irony here in that the employer repeatedly complained that Mahan did not implement progressive discipline when dealing with residents.)
- terminated at will without recourse. Mike Mahan received counseling for incidents on May 23 and May 31, 1987 prior to the completion of the OJT program. He also received counseling for incidents on August 20, October 15 and November 1, 1986. The major change in Mike Mahan's standing over this time was his involvement with the preparation of a list of complaints. The timing of his discharge, shortly after Larry Williams became aware of his involvement with the list of complaints, is more than coincidental.
- 11. There is substantial evidence that Mike Mahan's participation in the drafting of the list of complaints was

a notivating factor in the decision to terminate him.

12. The employer did not show that Mike Mahan was discharged pursuant to any disciplinary/evaluation policy or system. It was not shown that Mike Mahan's performance just prior to termination was substantially more deficient than it had been previously. Nor was it shown that he was subjected to a policy, system or practice of progressive discipline or remedial training to correct alleged deficiencies. Nor was it shown that he had ever been advised that his performance was so deficient as to jeopardize his continued employment.

IV. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

н

13.

19:

- The Board of Personnel Appeals has jurisdiction in this matter under Section 39-31-101 et seq., MCA.
- 2. Pursuant to Section 2-18-102, MCA the Department of Administration has promulgated Rules, Administrative Rules of Montana 2.21,3808 through 2.21.3812, dealing with probationary employees. Accordingly, an employee may be discharged at any time during this six month probationary period. The probationary period may be extended. Mike Mahan was such a probationary employee.
- 3. The Montana Collective Bargaining Law for Public Employees at Section 39-31-101 et seq., MCA, specifically Section 39-31-401, MCA makes it an unfair labor practice for a public employer to interfere with, restrain, or coerce employees in the exercise of their right to engage in self-organization, to form, join or assist any labor organization and to engage in other concerted activities for the purpose of mutual aid or protection.

The language in the Montana Collective Bargaining for Public Employees Act setting forth employee rights (Section 39-31-201, MCA) and defining of unfair labor practices on

the part of employers (Section 39-31-401, MCA) is nearly identical to similar provisions in Section 7 and 8 of the National Labor Relations Act, 29 USC 150 ct seq. Therefore, practice and precedent pursuant to the National Labor Relations Act must be given great weight. City of Great Palls v. Young, 686 P.2d 185, 119 LEMM 2682.

Section 39-31-201, MCA in language very similar to Section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act, states that public employees shall have and shall be protected in the exercise of certain rights or activities. These protected activities include assisting any labor organization and engaging in concerted activities for the purpose of mutual aid or protection.

Concerted activities have been defined as those activities which are for the purpose of inducing or preparing for group action to correct a grievance or cosplaint. Indiana Gear Works v NLRB, 371 F.2d 273, 64 LRRM 2253; Prill v. NLRB, 751 F.2d 941, 118 LRRM 2649; Ontario Knife Company v NLRB, 637 F.2d 840, 106 LRRM 2053.

The mutual aid or protection clause protects activities beyond grievance settlement, collective bargaining and self-organization. NLRB v Coca Cols Bottling Company of Buffalo, Inc., 811 F.2d 82, 124 LRRM 2585; Eastex, Inc. v NLRB, 556 F.2d 1280, 98 LRRM 2717.

Mike Mahan's participation in the formulation and drafting of the list of complaints was protected activity under Section 39-31-201, MCA.

4. Section 39-31-401(1), MCA is similar to Section 8(a)(1) of the National Labor Relations Act and must be distinguished from Section 39-31-401(3), MCA which is similar to Section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act. Section 39-31-401(1), MCA makes it an unfair labor practice for a

public employer to interfere with, restrain or coerce employees in the exercise of rights guaranteed in Section 39-31-201, MCA.

В

The protection afforded employees under Section 39-31-401(1), MCA is not exclusive to union activity but extends to any group activity for nutual aid or protection. Therefore, Pine Bills School has committed an unfair labor practice if Mike Mahan's discharge interfered with, restrained, or coerced his right to engage in concerted activity.

It is not necessary to show that the discharge had the effect of discouraging union membership. It is necessary only to show that the discharge interfered with Nike Mahan's right to engage in concerted activity for mutual aid or protection to show a violation of Section 39-31-401(1), MCA.

NRLB v McCatron, 216 P.2d 212, 35 LRRM 2012; NRLB v. Burnup and Sims, Inc., 379 US 21, 57 LRRM 2385; Modern Motors v NLRB, 198 P.2d 925, 38 LRRM 2628.

5. It is not necessary to show that Mike Mahan's concerted and therefore protected activities were the sole reason for his discharge. It is only necessary to show that his protected activity was a notivating factor in his discharge. NLRB v. Transportation Management Corporation, 462 US 393, 113 LRRM 2857; Board of Trustees v State of Montana, 504 P.2d 770, 103 LRRM 3090.

There is substantial evidence that Mike Mahan's concerted, and therefore protected, activity was a motivating factor in Larry Williams' decision to discharge Mike Mahan. The implementation of the decision to discharge interfered with, restrained or coerced Mike Mahan's rights under Section 39-31-201, MCA and is therefore an unfair labor practice pursuant to Section 39-31-401(1), MCA.

1 Both the United States Supreme Court and the 2 Montana Supreme Court have determined that if the charging 3 party has shown substantial evidence that an employee was 4 illegally discharged for protected activity, the burden is 5 on management to show, by a preponderance of the swidence 6 that the reason for discharge was not related to protected 7 activity. MLRB v. Transportation Management Corporation, 8 supra, Board of Trustees v State of Montana, supra. 9 10

The employer, therefore, had a burden to show by a preponderance of the evidence that Mike Mahan would have been discharged absent his protected activity. The employer has clearly failed to do so.

Pine Hills School, a public employer subject to the Montana Collective Act for Public Employes committed an unfair labor practice when Mike Mahan was discharged. Mike Mahan's protected activity was a sotivating factor in his discharge. He would not have been discharged on November 5, 1986 but for his concerted and protected activity.

V. RECOMMENDED ORDER

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

It is hereby ordered that after this order becomes final, Pine Hills School, its officers, agents, and representatives shall:

- cease and desist its violation of Section 39-31-401, MCA;
- take affirmative action by reinstating Mike Mahan as a Cottage Life Attendant at the Pine Hills School;
- make Mike Mahan whole by repaying him for all lost wages, including interest and all benefits which he would have received had he not been terminated on November 5, 1986;
- 4. meet with union representatives of Mike Mahan and attempt to determine the amount due him under number 3 above, if a mutual determination cannot be made within ten (10) days, notify this Board so that a hearing may be held and a detailed remedial order issued;

- post in a conspicuous place in the Pine Hills School copies of the attached notice marked "Appendix";
- notify this Board in writing within twenty (20) days what steps have been taken to comply with this order.

VI. NOTICE

Exceptions to these Pindings of Pact, Conclusions of Law, and Recommended Order may be filed within twenty (20) days of service thereof. If no exceptions are filed, the Recommended Order shall become the Final Order of the Board of Personnel Appeals. Address exceptions to the Board of Personnel Appeals, P.O. Box 1728, Helena, Montana 59624.

Dated this a DTA ay of August, 1987.

Kriyn L. Flowman Hearing Examiner

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned does certify that a true and correct copy of this document was served upon the following on the day of August, 1987, postage paid and addressed as follows:

Carole Colbo
Labor Relations Specialist
Labor Relations and Employee Benefits Bureau
Department of Administration
State of Montane
Hitchell Bldg., Room 130
Helena, MT 59620

David W. Stiteler
Staff Attorney
Montana Public Employees Association
P.O. Box 5600
Helena, MT 59604

Lagran Lener

AB1:050vt

32.